UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/703,856	11/01/2000	Darryl Black	102689-61/00-U0082	3720

21125 7590 06/03/2004

NUTTER MCCLENNEN & FISH LLP
WORLD TRADE CENTER WEST
155 SEAPORT BOULEVARD
BOSTON, MA 02210-2604

EXAMINER	
LIN, WEN TAI	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2154	2

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/703,856	Applicant(s) BLACK ET AL.	
	Examiner Wen-Tai Lin	Art Unit 2154	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *01 November 2000*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-39* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☒ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-39 are presented for examination.

2. Claims 15-17 and 33-34 are objected to because the following terms lack antecedent basis:

In claims 15 and 17	"the second database"; and
In claims 16-17 and 33-34,	"the first database".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 1-3, 5, 9-10 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by North et al.[U.S. Pat. No. 6505245].

5. As to claims 1-3, North teaches the invention as claimed including: a method of managing a telecommunications network, comprising:

- storing user profile data corresponding to a user profile in a first data repository [16, Fig.1 or 28, 30, Fig.2; 116, Fig.5; col.5, lines 28-40; i.e., the first data repository is a central data repository];
- storing network device data corresponding to a network device in the telecommunications network in a second data repository [col.7, lines 58-62; i.e., the network device data are originally stored locally (embedded) with each device];
- detecting a request from a user for network device data corresponding to the network device, wherein the user request is associated with the user profile;
- generating a data access request to the second data repository utilizing the user profile data from the first data repository; and
- retrieving network device data from the second data repository in accordance with the user request.

[for the last three limitations see, e.g., col.4, line 42 – col.5, line 60; col.5, lines 3-11; col.10, line 37 – col.11, line 9; and col.16, line 38 – col.17, line 9]

6. As to claim 5, North further teaches displaying the retrieved network device data in a user interface [col.8, lines 23-33].

7. As to claims 9-10, North further teaches that the user profile data includes a group access level [col.5, lines 22-27; col.14, lines 39-44], wherein authorized users of the group must have a corresponding password [col.5, lines 3-4].

8. As to claim 20, North further teaches detecting a request from a user for network device data, comprises:

- detecting the user request through a network management system (NMS) client [e.g., 50-54, Fig.2]; and
- sending the user request from the NMS client to an NMS server [28, 30, Fig.2],

wherein the NMS server generates the data access request to the second data repository utilizing the user profile data from the first data repository and retrieves network device data from the second data repository in accordance with the user request [col.2, line 66 –col.3, line 10]; and wherein the method further comprises: sending the retrieved network device data from the NMS server to the NMS client [col.7, lines 17-29].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 4, 6-8 and 12-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over North et al.(hereafter "North")[U.S. Pat. No. 6505245], as applied to claims 1-3, 5, 9-10 and 20 above.

11. As to claim 4, North teaches that the profile data, together with other data spaces, are part of an organized memory subsystem [see Fig.5]. North does not specifically teach that the first and second data can be stored in databases.

However, for ease of data query and maintenance storing a plurality of mutually relevant data items in a database (e.g., in the form of relational database) is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that North's first and second data can be stored in databases because North's first and second data are subject to frequent accesses, and by organizing North's first and second data repository as databases would facilitate the data retrieval and maintenance.

12. As to claims 6 and 8, North does not specifically teach that the user profile data includes an IP address assigned to the network device.

However, North teaches in one scenario that a remote console may manage a plurality of devices via the Internet [Fig.1b; col.1, line 67 – col.2, line 16] and in another

scenario that a plurality of remote consoles may manage a plurality of devices by connecting the remote consoles to a central managing terminal via the Internet [Fig.2]. As such, it is obvious that North's system/method applies to a combined scenario wherein the central managing terminal is only a node in the entire Internet and communicating from each individual managing console to a managed device would require an IP address that is pre-assigned to the device.

Under such circumstances, it is obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the pre-assigned IP address can be included in each of the user profiles because each of North's remote console has to retrieve information associated with the user's pre-assigned role including which devices can be managed by the remote console and it would facilitate the database management by associating the IP addresses that are assigned to each individual console in the user profile.

Note that, in a sense, the central terminal of North's system functions as a domain name server for the remote managing consoles because the IP addresses of the managed devices are determined at the central terminal.

13. As to claim 7, North further teaches that the user profile data further includes a port identification for a port on the network device [col.4, lines 41-45 and 61-65; 30, 41-1 – 41-N, Fig.2].

14. As to claims 12-16, North teaches substantially the invention as presented in the claims above. North further teaches that devices are arranged in logical groups with

events of each group associated with a respective console, which may in turn be referenced by the group name when defining action for an event [See Abstract and col.5, lines 22-27]. Thus although North does not specifically teach how the group name is being used in identifying and retrieving device data from the second data repository, it is noted that such features are rather obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art because the group name is now part of the key indices in North's database and the use of it would facilitate retrieval of authorized user information and device data from the related database.

15. Claims 11 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over North et al.(hereafter "North") [U.S. Pat. No. 6505245], as applied to claims 1-10, 12-16 and 20 above, further in view of Lim [U.S. Pat. No. 6434619].

16. As to claim 11, North the system communicates to managed devices via SNMP protocol [col.3, lines 7-10]. North does not specifically teach that the user profile data includes a simple network management protocol (SNMP) community string.

However, in the same field of endeavor, Lim teaches an Internet-based service management system wherein SNMP command string and user attributes are stored in a repository (e.g., a user profile included in a relational database) for allowing a remote operator to configure network elements in accordance with specific requirements [col.3, lines 1-29; col.17, lines 35-38].

In light of Lim's teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have included the SNMP community string in North's user profile data because the SNMP community string is specific in accordance with the level of access right assigned to each user and by including the SNMP community string it would facilitate the access of such information from the database.

17. As to claim 17, North teaches that the first and second data repositories are part of memory subsystems. North does not specifically teach that the data repositories are relational databases and the user profile data is stored in at least one table within the first database and network device data is stored in at least one table within the second database.

However, Lim teaches that the repositories can be in the form of relational databases [e.g., col. 3, lines 10-29], wherein storing the user profile data and network device data in a respective table within each database is an obvious option.

In light of Lim's teaching, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to also organize North's repositories as relational databases because it would facilitate the query from a remote operator for information stored therein.

18. Claims 18-19 and 21-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over North et al.(hereafter "North")[U.S. Pat. No. 6505245], as applied to claims 1-17 and 20 above, further in view of Official Notice.

19. As to claims 18-19, North does not specifically teach generating, after detecting a user's logon request, a user profile logical managed object (LMO) including at least a portion of the user profile data from the first data repository and use the LMO to request access to the second data repository utilizing the user profile data from the LMO.

However, Official Notice is taken that logical managed object for repeated access to a designated device or web server such as a cookie is well known in the art.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to generate a LMO similar to a cookie after a user's logon request is detected because by applying the LMO in the authentication and authorization process, it could prevent a user from repeating the logon process whenever a new connection session to the same target device or website is intended.

20. As to claims 21-26, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1, 18 and 20, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1, 18 and 20 above.

21. As to claim 31, North further teaches that the network device data retrieved from the second data repository comprises configured resource data associated with the group name [col.4, line 61- col.5, line2].

22. As to claims 27-30 and 32-39, since the features of these claims can also be found in claims 1-4, 12, 14-16, 18, 26 and 36-37, they are rejected for the same reasons set forth in the rejection of claims 1-4, 12, 14-16, 18, 26 and 36-37 above.

23. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure:

Mukaiyama et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6631407];

Shannon [U.S. Pat. No. 6233618];

Chang et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 5958016];

Rothermel et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6678827];

Combar et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6470386]; and

Guheen et al. [U.S. Pat. No. 6721713].

24. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 (three) months and 0 days from the mail date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will result in ABANDONMENT of the application (see 35 U.S.C. 133, M.P.E.P. 710.02, 710.02(b)).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen-Tai Lin whose telephone number is (703)305-4875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (8:00-5:00) .

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Follansbee can be reached on (703)305-8498. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

(703)872-9306 for official communications; and

(703)746-5516 for status inquires draft communication.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703)305-3900.

Wen-Tai Lin

May 27, 2004